

OWAccess Advisory Council Meeting
Minutes of August 26, 2003

F i n a l

Present: Quent Boyken, Herb Strentz, Craig Hiemstra, Jane Ginapp, Sheila Castaneda (by phone), Richard Neri (by phone), Glen Dickinson (by phone), David Redlawsk (by phone), Bob Brunkhorst (by phone)

Absent: Corlis Moody, Gail Flagel, Marsha Ternus, Bill Dotzler, Ervin Dennis, Greg Stevens, Miriam Ubben, Kelly Hayworth

Guests: John Gillispie, Larry Murphy, Nadir Mehta, Tim Erickson, Denise Sturm, Marianne Mickelson, Kit Krogmeier, Randy Clemenson, Diane Van Zante

1) Introduction of Information Technology Enterprise (ITE) Support Staff – Quent Boyken, Chair, opened the meeting. Nadir Mehta introduced the ITE support staff that would be assisting with future IOWAccess activities.

2) Review and Approve Minutes of July 9, 2003 Council Meeting – Larry Murphy noted a correction to the July minutes in that he was in attendance at that meeting. Herb Strentz moved, seconded by Jane Ginapp, that the minutes be approved, as corrected. All those in favor voted aye, there were no opposing votes.

3) Update on Contract Negotiations with Iowa Interactive – John Gillispie stated that the Iowa Interactive contract was fairly complex (summary provided at the meeting). ITE is in the process of renegotiating the contract and hopes to complete negotiations by the end of September. Iowa Interactive and ITE met a few weeks earlier and laid out some parameters. Iowa Interactive's parent company, the National Information Consortium (NIC), responded positively. As we move forward, Iowa Interactive will no longer be funded by legislative appropriation, but rather through flat fees, specifically the fees charged for Department of Motor Vehicle records. Iowa Interactive's responsibilities will not change under the new contract, only the way in which they are compensated. This approach will favorably impact the amount of funding that the IOWAccess Advisory Council has on hand for other projects.

4) The Evolution of E-Government – John Gillispie (handout). John gave a brief overview of the five stages of the model: 1) emerging web presence, 2) enhanced web presence, 3) interactive web presence, 4) transactional web presence, and 5) seamless web presence. John's view is that in Iowa, we bypassed stages three and four. From an advisory board perspective, it is very important that we look closely at where the various service offerings actually exist. The State of Washington has an award-winning E-Government program through. We need to step back a bit, analyze where we are, and determine what services offer the most value for our citizens.

5) Discuss Comments from Focus Groups Evaluating the New Design for the State of Iowa Website – Tim Erickson, General Manager of Iowa Interactive (handout). Focus groups were held across the state in order gather citizen input. Comments were similar statewide. Generally, people liked the look and feel of the site. The main suggestion centered on promoting the State of Iowa as much as possible. We will be working with the Department of Economic Development to increase marketing efforts through the state website. The website search engine is more functional and provides better search capabilities. As a result of the focus groups, numerous changes were made. The Chair urged council members to visit the website periodically and provide any feedback on the site. As a follow-up to one of the focus groups, Iowa Interactive was asked to provide further information about applications implemented by its parent company in other states. Reviewing those, in addition to the proposals submitted to ITE, will allow the council more flexibility in determining what services actually offer the most value to Iowa citizens. Council members mentioned visiting the state website, but not being able to find what they were looking for. Tim advised that these issues would be addressed on the new website.

6) Review Two Projects: "Ask Iowa" and "Digital Democracy" – Tim Erickson was asked to provide further information about two projects mentioned previously: the Ask Iowa Project, and the Digital Democracy Project (both projects are summarized in a handout that Tim provided). Some work has been completed on these projects, but at present they are not being pursued. If the council wishes to pursue either of these, there would basically be no additional cost for personnel time, but there might be additional expense for server space, etc. Several members indicated their support for the Digital Democracy Project. Council members were encouraged to think nationally and globally. Nadir Mehta asked the council to postpone a recommendation due to the fact that contract negotiations were currently underway with Iowa Interactive. The Chair asked that ITE note the council's interest in pursuing the two projects as ITE

proceeds with contract terms. Glen Dickinson asked that the digital democracy project be coordinated with the Legislative Services Agency.

7) Budget – Denise Sturm reported that we are currently closing out FY03. At present, Denise does not have an updated forecast for FY04. Carryover from FY03 to FY04 should be around \$280,000.

8) Review Requests for FY04 IOWAccess Funding – There are eight projects for the council to review. Randy Clemenson reported that a group from ITE had given the project ROIs a general review. The results of that review were shared with the council.

Because it was believed that there would be adequate funding to cover the projects that were submitted, the council chose not to rank order the projects. Council members noted that in many cases, there was no justification detailing how the money would be spent, several of the proposals were incomplete (how many citizens would be affected, etc.?), many applications were vague, lacked detail, and didn't make their own case. Some projects indicated no long-term costs, so a question arose about how these projects would be supported in the future. Another issue raised was whether the benefits were worth the money being spent (example: \$45,000 request that would benefit 300 people). Quent proposed that the council talk about each one of the eight projects briefly and come to some degree of consensus on each one. Council members discussed the need for additional information, including the possibility of having someone come to the next meeting to make a presentation and/or answer questions.

Project IA-005-P-029 - Department of Education, Web Based Teacher License Renewal. This project was discussed at a previous meeting.

Project IA-001 – Department of Human Services, Child Development Home Registration Renewals. Several questions arose about this project. Herb Strentz moved that we table this project until we receive more information. Craig Hiemstra seconded the motion. All those in favor voted aye, there were no opposing votes. ITE staff was asked to conduct follow-up.

Project IA-004-P-009 – Submitted by the Department of Inspections and Appeals regarding Food Inspections Online. This is both an upgrade and extension of technology.

Herb asked how we implement cost controls. Randy responded that we don't actually transfer the money upfront, but require agencies to submit their costs to us and then reimburse them.

Quent asked for an ongoing financial update on the projects indicating the amount committed, spent, and remaining, so that the council can track unused funds and utilize them for other purposes. ITE advised that it plans to do so.

Craig Hiemstra moved, seconded by Sheila Castaneda, that the council accept this project. All those in favor voted aye, there were no opposing votes. Since a quorum of members was not present, the vote was not official.

Project IA-003-P-008 – Department of Inspections and Appeals regarding Social Gambling Online. This project should reduce staff labor considerably. Craig Hiemstra moved, seconded by Jane Ginapp, that the council accept this project. All those in favor voted aye, there were no opposing votes. Since a quorum of members was not present, the vote was not official.

Project IA-006-P-025 – Ethics and Campaign Finance Disclosure regarding Public Access Improvements. There was a suggestion that we combine the three Ethics and Campaign Finance projects (IA-006-P-025 WRS Public Access Improvements, P-026 Miscellaneous Contribution Tracking, and P-027 Lobbyist/Client Tracking System) to see if efficiencies could be achieved by doing so. Two pieces of information are needed: what savings can be achieved by combining all three projects, what are the pre and post project costs? Herb moved, seconded by Craig, that the three projects be approved subject to the two additional pieces of information. All those in favor voted aye, there were no opposing votes. Since a quorum of members was not present, the vote was not official.

Project IA-002-P-007 – Department of Inspections and Appeals regarding TSB Online. This is a technological advancement that involves moving from a paper-based system to a web-based system. Council members would like to encourage small businesses in Iowa and also felt that this project would expedite government processes. Sheila moved, seconded by Herb, that the council accept the project. All

those in favor voted aye, there were no opposing votes. Since a quorum of members was not present, the vote was not official.

Outcome: 4 projects approved
3 projects approved, subject to additional information
1 project tabled

Since a quorum was not available, this outcome will still need to be ratified by a quorum of the members.

It was suggested that in the future, ITE take a more proactive role in informing agencies that there are funds available. Randy clarified that this was essentially a first time effort. Kit Krogmeier asked if funding was available to local governments and school districts. No one was certain about the answer; ITE was asked to check into the matter. Sheila suggested that future proposals to be more thorough and include better justification for budget figures. The council recommended that future project proposals be received three weeks prior to the council meeting.

Council members discussed holding a phone conference prior to the next regular meeting in order to ratify the decisions reached at today's meeting. Since further information is needed on some of the projects, that may not be a workable idea.

9) Wrap-Up – The next regular meeting is tentatively set for Tuesday, November 11 at 1:00 p.m. Diane Van Zante will secure a location and confirm the date/time with council members.

Diane asked if there was anyone who wanted to file a travel claim (reimbursement).

The meeting adjourned at 3:26 p.m.